HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Chapel and College

Occasional Papers

of the

ational Association of College and University Chaplains

Number One

Winter 1957

Chapel and College

Occasional Papers

of the

National Association of College and University Chaplains

Number One Winter, 1957

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"The Church and the College Church" ..... Page 3
CHAPLAIN ROBERT RANKIN, CLAREMONT COLLEGES

Comments on "The Church and the College Church" ..... Page 24
THE REV. HARRY SMITH, CHAPEL HILL, N.C.
DEAN HARRY KRUENER, DENISON UNIVERSITY
THE REV. KENNETH REEVES, SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS
CHAPLAIN SIDNEY LOVETT, YALE UNIVERSITY
MR. MILTON McLEAN, OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
CHAPLAIN SAMUEL RUDDER, ST. AUGUSTINE'S COLLEGE

This "occasional paper" of the National Association of College and University Chaplains is an attempt to begin making available to our members substantial and stimulating articles relevant to the work and problems of college chaplains and others who share their interests. It is planned that this will be the first in a series of such papers, to appear perhaps three times a year. Future issues are already in the process of being written and produced. The chief justification for them, and our hope in producing them, is that they may assist in and enrich the work and thought of members of the Association.

Such substantial essays are intended to supplement the information and news made available in the "NACUC Newsletter." The Committee on Publications of the Association is responsible for both publications, and we are indebted for their production especially to Dean Charles Havice, the Chairman, and to Chaplains Richard Unsworth and Sam Newcomer. The committee, which is listed on the back cover of this issue, would welcome suggestions and editorial correspondence about this and future issues.

The essay which makes up the chief content of this issue was written

87879
by Chaplain Robert Rankin of the Associated Colleges of Claremont. It deals with the role and problems of the college church. The College Church of Claremont is now attempting to work out an understanding of its own place in the wider life of the colleges and the churches. Their present research and planning is being made possible under a special grant from the Danforth Foundation.

The comments on this article have been written by several of the Association's members and friends, each from the point of view of a different church or college situation. We are indebted to them all for their willingness to contribute to this exchange.

The appearance of "College and Chapel" is a part of the effort being made by the Association to extend its usefulness and influence. The life of the Association in the past eight years has centered largely in the annual national meetings. It is hoped that an extended program of regional conferences, useful publications, and more adequate coverage of those active in the field of the college chaplaincy will give the Association a more significant role in the life of college chaplains and those who share their interests. Only this could justify the appearance of another journal at this time.

E. C. Reckard

Brown University

THE CHURCH AND THE COLLEGE CHURCH

CHAPLAIN ROBERT RANKIN
The Associated Colleges of Claremont

College churches constitute a new emergent in Christendom. This new form of the Christian Church has proved itself of extraordinary worth in the spiritual and intellectual growth of both students and teachers, yet within these churches many questions of critical importance remain unanswered. For example: Is a college church really a Christian church? Or is it simply a college chapel program conducted on Sunday? Can a college church develop a meaningful relationship to the denominations, to the student Christian movement, and to the ecumenical church? Can college churches, which include students and teachers from all denominations and from many religious perspectives, take responsible positions regarding the great theological and moral issues of the day? Can they meaningfully include Christians of both sharply liberal and markedly conservative persuasions, as well as those whose convictions may be between those two positions?

Since its establishment in 1949, the College Church of the Associated Colleges of Claremont,[1] has lived with these questions, answering some of them and ruminating about others. Its officers now believe the time has come to enter into a vigorous and extensive inquiry into the nature and task of the College Church. A generous and imaginative grant from the Danforth Foundation has enabled us to do just that, and plans are now being formed for a three year study of several of the most critical problems which college or university churches encounter.[2]

One of the basic theological questions before us is this: Is a college church a church, measured by the standards of historic Christianity?

Let us then raise three primary questions. The first is: What are the marks or signs of the Christian Church? Second, what characteristics of the college community have particular significance for the college church? And third, measured by the criteria of the first section, is our College Church at Claremont a church?

---

1 The Claremont Colleges include Claremont College (the graduate school), Claremont Men's College, Pomona College and Scripps College.

2 Mrs. Marilee Scaff has been selected to serve as Executive Secretary of the Claremont College Church Study. Inquiries may be addressed to her at the College Church, Sumner Hall, Claremont, California.

I

The Church

The Christian Church is difficult to delineate, its boundaries being many. Perhaps we may begin best by proposing that the Church is a separate visible community of human beings, marked off from other communities by a spiritual purpose, that of calling Christian people together to worship God and to serve Him. Yet the most distinctive characteristic of the Christian Church is theological rather than sociological. Its members believe in Jesus as the Christ and seek to become obedient to Him, as disciples. They are so caught by the conviction that Jesus has unique significance that they not only believe in Him as the Christ and follow Him, that is, become Christians; but gather themselves into a community to serve Him together, that is, become churchmen.

Wilbert F. Howard, commenting on the Fourth Gospel, writes: "A turning point in the ministry of Jesus is marked in John 6:66-70 when a separation is noted between a large and loosely attached body of disciples who 'went back and walked no more with' Jesus, and the twelve who found in His teaching words of eternal life....This is the nucleus of the Christian Church."[3]

Following the life and time of Jesus, the point of separation between the church and those apart from the church seemed to be belief in the resurrection. Thus the late Clarence Craig wrote in a World Council of Churches study, "No one can doubt....that the resurrection of Jesus was central for the Church of the New Testament. Those who believed that God has raised Christ from the dead comprised the Church."[4]

Thus we may say that the Christian Church is a separated, visible community whose members recognize Jesus as the Christ, and affirm a faith in God, which has been made indestructible by belief in the resurrection. Basic to this definition is the fundamental Christian belief that the church is not man-made but created by God. It is a community which worships God in response to the Holy Spirit working amongst its members.

"Community" is a key word in understanding the nature of the church. Bishop Lesslie Newbigin, a bishop of the church of South India,

---

3 Howard, Wilbert. "Introduction to the Gospel of John," *Interpreter's Bible*, (Abingdon Press), Vol. 8, p. 444.

4 Craig, Clarence. "The Church of the New Testament," *Man's Disorder and God's Design*, (Harper and Brothers), Vol. 1, pp.34-35.

in his book, *The Household of God*, puts it plainly: "It is surely a fact of inexhaustible significance that what our Lord left behind Him was not a book, nor a creed....but a visible community."[5]

J. Robert Nelson in the booklet, "The Christian Student and the Church," reminds us, as do so many these days, that we do not grasp the full meaning of "community" until we understand the Greek word, "koinonia." He calls it "the distinctive word applied to (the)....basic pattern of the corporate life of Christians....To translate this word as mere 'fellowship' or 'community' is to do it an injustice, for it carries in the strongest possible sense the meaning of mutuality, communal love, the sharing or participation in the goods, pleasures, griefs, and spiritual gifts of all those whom God has knit together through their faith in Jesus Christ."[6]

We should note especially this characteristic of "sharing," for therein we find evidence of an outward thrust which is an authentic mark of the church. In the Christian Church, from its beginning, there has been little desire for isolation. Christians have in fact been deeply and powerfully motivated to share their faith. Thus the church has been a missionary and evangelistic community addressing itself to persons beyond the community.

This concern for the larger social life has not been confined to the propagation of the faith. The church, recognizing the ethical implications of the gospel, has sought to be a moral community, committed to the moral values and the ethical teachings of the Old and New Testaments. A mark of the church then is its commitment in its work and services to the ways of integrity, justice, and love, as declared by the prophets and by Jesus Christ. It is called upon to concern itself with moral and ethical problems in the society in which it lives as well as within its own boundaries. This means that the church is required not only to teach its members to live righteously in their private relationships, but also in society to bring justice and brotherhood to economic and social relationships, to national and international life.

The sense of mutuality and communal love reached its peak of expression in the mind of Saint Paul who visualized the church as a *body*, whose members are as intimately related and as interdependent as the hand and the arm, the foot and the leg. This is the Body of Christ, whose head, or mind, is Christ. If one member of the body suffers, the whole

---

5 Newbigin, Lesslie, *The Household of God*, (Friendship Press), p. 20.

6 Nelson J. Robert, *The Christian Student and the Church*, (Association Press), p. 55.

body suffers. Thus Eugene S. Wehrli, writing in a study guide on Newbigin's book, says: "To suffer when a fellow member suffers is somewhat like the experience of a father whose heart is torn in compassion when his child is hit by a car. He does not experience the child's pain, but he knows a different pain."[7]

Karl Barth, the eminent European theologian, emphasizes another aspect of the church when he describes it as "event." Writing in the World Council report mentioned earlier, Barth declares that "the congregation *is*, or *exists*, where and in so far as it dares to live by the act of its living Lord.... The congregation is the event in which the divine mission of Jesus Christ is represented and attested; through the preaching of His word, through the invitation to believe on Him, and also through the manifestation of the temporal, political, and social significance of the salvation that has appeared in Him in the midst of the 'non-Christian' world...."[8]

The evidence one can gather to support this position is noteworthy. Luther wrote: "Wherever you see this Word preached, believed, confessed, and acted on, there do not doubt that there must be a true *ecclesia sancta catholica*....for God's word does not go away empty."[9] John Calvin wrote: "Wherever we see the word of God sincerely preached and heard, wherever we see the sacraments administered according to the institution of Christ, there we cannot have any doubt that the Church of God has some existence, since His promise cannot fail, 'Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them'."[10]

The Body which is the church is recognized not only as a spiritual reality of the early church, and as an "event", but also as a continuing body, to which all Christians of all times are related. Thus Bishop Newbigin, having asked, "By what signs or works can a body rightly claim *today* to be the Church of God?" puts "event" first, saying, "We are incorporated in Christ by hearing and believing the Gospel." But then

---

7 Wehrli, Eugene S., *Rediscovering the Church*, (United Student Fellowship), p. 15.

8 Barth, Karl, "The Church - The Living Congregation," in *Man's Disorder and God's Design*, (Harper and Brothers), Vol. 1, pp.67, 69.

9 Newbigin, Lesslie, *op. cit.*, p. 47, quoting from Holman, Ed., on *The Council and the Churches*, V, p. 271.

10 *Imbid.*, from *The Institutes*. IV, 1, 9.

quickly he emphasizes the necessity of "sacramental participation in the life of the historically continuous Church." Moreover, he calls into question the Reformers' and Barth's zealous emphasis on "event."

Newbigin writes, "The Reformers have given us an intensely dynamic conception of the Church....They took with immense seriousness the truth that the Church is the Body of Christ, that He is ever dynamically creative in it and through it, that He, the Living Lord, is in very truth present today in His Church through the word and sacraments with power to create....to convert, to reconcile....The obvious defect of this conception....is that it gives no real place to the continuing life of the Church as one fellowship binding the generations together in Christ. It makes of the Church practically a series of totally disconnected events in which, at each moment and place at which the word and the sacraments of the Gospel are set forth, the Church is there and then called into being by God's creative power. I am aware that I am exaggerating,.... nevertheless it is difficult not to feel, in....Karl Barth....that this dynamic doctrine of the Church is taken to....almost this extreme point.. ..The eschatological has completely pushed out the historical. The Church cannot be defined simply as that which is constituted by the event of the preaching of the Gospel....It belongs to its true nature that it is a continuing historical society, that society which was constituted and sent forth once for all by Jesus Christ."[11]

Wehrli, commenting on Newbigin, warns us however that continuity and institutionalism have their dangers: convictions easily arise regarding the infallibility of the institution, and compulsions are felt to stand in line. He points to two tragic consequences of institutionalism: "....works and law become substituted for repentance and faith; ...tradition and institutional authority - even control - take the place of the vital experience and inspiration of God."[12]

The corrective to this undue emphasis on institutionalism is recognition of the Community of the Holy Spirit, in which the Holy Spirit breaks in, upsets the old, denies the absolutizing of the relative, invites freedom, threatens old dogmas and forms, and in so doing imparts strength to the church. Newbigin himself registers this as a mark of the church, saying, "We are incorporated in Christ....by receiving and abiding in the Holy Spirit."

---

11 *Imbid.*, p. 60.

12 Wehrli, E. S., *op. cit.*, p. 19.

A still more radical interpretation can be given to the "Community o the Holy Spirit," and I for one must register it, though it has bot dangers and complications. It may in the minds of some have nothin to do with the church, yet I am bothered by the possibility that it ha much significance for the church. It pertains to the church not as per sons in a visible, recognizable community explicitly committed to Jesu Christ, but as persons who respond, sometimes singly, sometimes corpor ately, to the Holy Spirit without awareness of the source or the partic ular nature of the motivating power which acts upon them.

It has been a central conviction of the faith that Christ did not begi and end in the moment of time represented by Jesus' life, but that Chris was in and of the beginning of the universe and of life. Paul, declarin his belief about Christ to the Colossians, wrote, "He is the image of th invisible God, the first born of all creation; for in Him all things wer created....He is before all things....He is the beginning." (Colossian 1:15-19). The writer of the Fourth Gospel proclaimed: "In the beginnin was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. H was in the beginning with God....And the Word became flesh and dwel among us, full of grace and truth."

What is meant by this? Is it not that Christ pre-existed Jesus Christ is in the beginning, Christ is in the very genesis of life, "the firs born of all creation." Arthur John Gossip helps us to get hold of thi idea, saying, "Peer into the dim past as far as you may, you will neve come on God alone. Always, from the beginningless beginning, there has been God. And always there has been another with Him, who is t God what a man's word and thought are to a man, through whom Go acts; and by whom He expresses Himself. It is the Logos...."[13]

It is of course this "Logos" which becomes flesh and is embodied i Jesus. More than personified wisdom or reason, this "Word" is the very being Jesus became, and which existed after His death, just as it ha existed before His life. Insights from one of the church fathers, Irenaeus and from a contemporary theologian, John Knox, may help us further Irenaeus explained that "the Son of God did not....begin to exist (a Jesus' birth), being with the Father from the beginning; but when He became incarnate and was made man, He commenced afresh the long lin of human beings, and furnished us....with salvation."[14] John Knox writes, "If....we ask, 'When did the event which we are considering be-

---

13 Gossip, Arthur John, "Exposition on the Gospel of John." *Interpreter's Bible*, (Abingdon Press) Vol. 8, p. 466.

14 Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*.

gin and when did it end?' the only possible....answer must be, 'It began when history itself began and it will end only when history itself shall end.' "[15]

Was Jesus Himself conscious of this? At least the writer of the Fourth Gospel was convinced that He was, for John quotes the Master as saying, "Before Abraham was, I am." (John 8:58.)

Now, if the church is created by God through Jesus Christ, then is it not conceivable that persons outside the church may also be touched by that very being which became Jesus, and which existed before Him, the Logos, and after Him, the Holy Spirit? Furthermore, we may ask the somewhat radical question: If the Christ pre-existed Jesus, could He not now exist quite apart from our understanding of the historical Jesus? If so, the Holy Spirit could be at work amongst even those who for good reasons or ignorance or neurosis cannot accept the Christian claims regarding the historical Jesus or the visible Church. They who respond to the work of the Logos or the Holy Spirit, without recognizing its connections with the historical Jesus or the visible church, might be said to be "members" of what Paul Tillich has called the "latent" church.[16] If we do not admit this, are we not saying that God is limited by our conceptions of the church, our conceptions of Jesus, our conceptions of God? Are these not limitations terrible to think about and quite impossible to put upon God?

Perhaps we would want to rule all this out, not on the ground of its being untrue, but on the ground that it is not applicable to the church. One might claim that it is so highly individualistic, rather than corporate, in its expression, that it can have no relation to the church. Or perhaps it should be ruled out because of its vulnerability to gross subjectivism. Indeed, the experience of the Logos is deeply subjective for the man who experiences it without knowing its nature or its objective embodiment in history. The Christian, however, seeing the Logos at work in another, sees it objectively for what it is. Knowing the Logos in the person of Jesus, the Christian can also recognize the work of the Logos in persons who do not themselves understand.

One important value this has for the church is that it may firmly remind the church that God is greater than the visible church and that God

---

15 Knox, John, *On the Meaning of Christ*, (Charles Scribner's Sons), p. 30-31.

16 The "latent" church is mentioned in a number of Tillich's writings. See Paul J. Tillich, "The Theology of Missions" in Christianity and Crisis, Vol. XV, No. 5, p. 35-36, April 5, 1955; *Propositions*, Part IV, p. 27; or Nels F. S. Ferre, "Tillich's View of the Church" in Kegley and Bretall, editors, *The Theology of Paul Tillich*, pp. 258-9.

works outside of the visible church as well as within it. The church is thus challenged to reconsider its mission, particularly to those whom we have suggested are part of the "latent" church. Professor Theodore M. Greene of Scripps College has written, "Every branch of the 'visible' church must, in the perspective of the 'invisible' church, acknowledge its inevitable parochialism; it dare not declare itself to be the institutional embodiment of all authentic spiritual insight, the one and only road to and vehicle of salvation. It must acknowledge that God's ways are not our ways, that the Spirit moveth as it listeth, and that the eternal Christ or Logos can and does become operative in history outside as well as within, its own special communion. It should, therefore, in all Christian humility, recognize and cherish any members of the 'latent' church which it is somehow able to identify."[17]

II

The College Community

A college church, in order to evaluate itself and its task, must first look carefully at the unique characteristics of the academic community in which it lives and works. Only by knowing the circumstances in which the church works may we know how the gospel may be communicated. Before we discuss the nature and task of the college church, therefore, it is important to indicate briefly several factors in the collegiate situation.

In the first place, the population of a college community is unusually concentrated as it is in a narrow age grouping. Though the presence of faculty members and administrators relieves this situation to some degree, the academic community is largely one of young men and women. The church, in determining its mission, should remember that it is addressing itself not to the whole community but to a special segment of society.

In the second place, the college church must work with a transient population, one which, save for the faculty, changes completely every four years. Its purpose and ways of work must be determined by this fact. Because of its transient student population, decisions which have been carefully and painfully arrived at have often to be reviewed and redecided or changed.

---

17 Theodore M. Greene, Professor of Philosophy at Scripps College, in an unpublished paper prepared for the Claremont College Church Retreat, September, 1956.

This fact of the transient nature of the student population has a third point of significance for a college church: it means that many students come to college church from local denominational churches, and that they are only temporarily in a non-denominational situation. We must assume that membership in college church in no sense establishes them in a permanent church home but should strengthen and prepare them for work in denominational churches in which they will take their places following graduation.

In the fourth place, a college church should recognize that it works with students and faculty who are in radically different religious situations. Some come to college having had rich experience in the churches, and are familiar with the Christian faith, committed to it, and devoted to the church. Others are religious illiterates who know very little if anything about the faith or the church and cannot be expected to act intelligently in reference to the church until they are informed about it and the faith it seeks to convey. Still others are in what we might call a post-Christian situation.[18] They think that they know what the Christian faith is - and that they have advanced beyond it. They believe that they no longer need to hold to "Christian superstitions," or at least they find themselves unable to do so. In determining its ways of work the college church needs to remember each of these groups and to prepare itself to minister to each in ways relevant to each situation.

In the fifth place, the college church needs to acknowledge that it is at work with, though not for, its institution and the administrators of that institution. Administrators and trustees rightfully expect the college church and chaplain to perform certain functions and to carry certain responsibilities within the academic community. This should never call for control by administrators. Alert college presidents are sharply aware that the "use" of a college church for public relations purposes would be intolerable, and that heavy-handed direction of its program would be deadly to the spiritual life of a college. Our college connections, however, do call for conscientious recognition among college church leaders that they have responsibilities for serving the educational institutions in which they work.

The function of the chaplain in this situation admittedly may become a bit ambiguous, if not downright ambivalent. In at least some colleges and universities the chaplain embraces two quite different functions. One is that of a pastor in a church. The other is that of a member of the col-

18 Professor Gordon Kaufman of the Pomona College Department of Religion has helpfully contributed this idea and its development to our discussions.

lege administrative staff officially responsible for the total religious program of the institution. In the first function he is plainly responsible not to the college administration but to the church; in the second he is responsible to the administration. That this situation does not often lead to spiritual and professional schizophrenia is a testimony to the fact that the purposes of the college and of the church are not in opposition but are complementary, and also to the wisdom and working flexibility of both presidents and parsons.

Finally, it is in the very nature of the college community that it is a community of inquiry, a place and a time for deep probing and questioning. The total impact of the college community is toward the development of reason and doubt, rather than faith and affirmation. This fact is sometimes taken by students and faculty to mean that reason is opposed to faith and that the academic community is set over against the community of believers.

Historically this has not been true. Colleges and universities were founded and nurtured by the church, their very existence being grounded in the church's belief that all truth comes from God and that Christians should know the truth that the truth might make them free. The church itself has understood the community of inquiry to be complementary to the community of faith.

III

The College Church

Now, when we look at our discussion on the marks of a Christian church - the church as a separate visible Christian community, as the body of Christ, as "event," as a sacramental participant in the life of an historically continuous institution, as the community of the Holy Spirit, aware also of God's working in the "latent" church - and then we look at our College Church in Claremont, California, perhaps all we can manage is a smile. But might we not also smile when we look at any church in the light of these expectations? In any event, let us ask: measured by these criteria, is our College Church a church?

In the first part of this paper we have said that the church is a separate, visible community of human beings, marked off from other communities by a spiritual purpose, that of calling Christian people together

or the worship and service of God. More definitively, it is a community whose members recognize Jesus as Christ, and in His name seek to serve God in their individual and corporate lives. Judging by this criterion, may the College Church call itself a church?

Comparing College Church with other campus religious organizations, we can begin to delineate its unique character. College Church is clearly different from campus Religious Councils which attempt to organize or coordinate the varied religious programs of campus life. Student Christian associations are, on most campuses, separate membership bodies using statements of religious commitment, but they emphasize programs of service and action and make no claims of being churches. Moreover, College Church is different from college chapel and vespers which possess no membership, make no confession of faith, and have no program of action and service.

Before membership in College Church was begun, one might have said that church differed from chapel only in the day of the week on which its service of worship was conducted. Even before membership began, however, the College Church had taken on a coloring quite different from chapel. Notice the Affirmation of Faith which was read in unison during the first College Church service on February 13, 1949: "We believe in God, the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ, His Son, our Lord, and in the Holy Spirit. We seek to know the will of God and to walk in His ways, made known or to be made known to us; to proclaim the Gospel to all mankind; to work and pray for the progress of knowledge, the promotion of justice, the reign of peace, and the realization of human brotherhood. And we look with faith for the triumph of righteousness and the life everlasting." That, I submit, makes a different sort of gathering from chapel.

A year and a half later when membership was established, this embryonic Christian community was becoming more visible. At this time the membership statement was weak, simply saying: "Realizing the value of worship and fellowship, guided by the teachings of Jesus, I wish to enroll in the College Church and to take part in its development." In the autumn of 1955 the College Church Board voted to establish a confessional membership. Members of the College Church now affirm:

> Believing in God and recognizing Jesus Christ as the embodiment of God's love, I wish to become a member of College Church and to join its members and friends in quest for fresh insights into the nature of the Christian faith and in search for a deeper understanding of the responsibilities of the Church for society.

This discussion ought not to end, however, without recording that growth toward confessional status in College Church has been painful. When the idea of membership was first introduced in 1951, it was strongly resisted on campus, the claim being that it would make an artificial and misleading separation of the sheep and the goats, a point not without merit and therefore painful. This was the situation which created the first and rather weak membership statement. In 1955 again pain was felt when, with the creation of a confessional membership, we found ourselves having to say that even though a student had labored valiantly in the Church, he could neither be nominated for elective office nor vote if he had not become a member of College Church, an act requiring him to make a statement of Christian commitment. And the pain continues! At our College Church Retreat this past September, a strong bid was made to change the membership requirement to permit also into full membership those students and faculty who are unable to make a specific Christian commitment and who are prepared only to explore Christian beliefs. And so we continue to live with this problem; however, our confessional membership statement still stands.

This confessional membership making explicit reference to Jesus Christ as "the embodiment of God's love" moves us, we believe, toward a more nearly authentic participation in the church as "a community whose members recognize Jesus as the Christ." Can we then say that we participate in the church as the Body of Christ, whose head is Christ and whose members are so intimately related that the suffering of one is the suffering of all? As to the source of unity, our membership statement declares that Jesus Christ is the embodiment of God's love. How persuasive, how real this is to the total membership of College Church I do not know, but to some members I know it to be intense and deep. Jesus is truly believed to be Lord and Saviour.

As to the members of the body, perhaps the best thing we can say is that the feeling of kinship is growing. Surely as one looks back in Claremont to a time fifteen years ago when there were only sporadic attempts at worship and those without any attempt at the creation of a continuing body, and then to the present when we have a membership unified by a confession, though a simple one, it would look as if we are moving toward deeper churchmanship, a keener sense of mutuality, of "koinonia."

To look at the New Testament vision of the body of Christ in which Saint Paul sees it as unified as a human body, however, is to look at something we simply do not possess in College Church. Our only consolation - an unhappy one - is to remember that the New Testament

church did not possess it fully. It knew conflicts, deep and sometimes bitter ones, about the place of the Gentiles in the church, about beliefs and practices. One remembers that few parish churches can claim the mutuality described in the 12th chapter of First Corinthians.

It should also be said that in our College Church we cannot rightly claim that the most important dimension of kinship is theological: work and worship are more vital to our sense of comradeship. Kinship in the College Church derives less from common confession than from sharing the common vocations of studying and teaching, and from working together in church activities such as the Choir, forums, community service, membership and worship committees, and church Retreats.

Pursuing the last phrase of our definition, can we say that we are a community whose members "seek to serve God in their individual and corporate lives"? How well we accomplish this goal may be a debatable question, but at least our heart is in the right place. College Church has tried to stress the responsibilities of Christians to declare and maintain ethical values in our society, saying, "Our belief in these values is in large part the fruit of the Hebrew-Christian tradition, for they are religious values and have never flourished for long in any secular society. They are derived from faith in God, the continuing source of all that men hold significant. The College Church seeks to preserve these values through its nurture of the religious understanding and experience of the students."[19]

Moreover, our program of activities has sought in a number of ways to express our concern for others. For several years students have carried on a regular program in recreation at Casa Colina, a crippled children's hospital in a neighboring town. We have a program of friendly visitations to elderly shut-ins in Claremont. Last year a group of students did outstanding work in clearing a piece of land and leading a recreational program among the Mexican children of our community - a program so much needed that the city recreation department has been persuaded to make it a part of their regular program. Our College Church Committee on Social Responsibility is now hard at work trying to develop a program for securing more Negro students in our colleges and for strengthening our interracial relationships.

Protestantism's historic insistence upon the preaching of the Word as a criterion of the church was proclaimed by Luther when he said,

---

19 College Church Brochure, 1954.

"Wherever you see this Word preached, believed, confessed, and acted on, there do not doubt that there must be a true *ecclesia sancta catholica*." Bishop Newbigin expressed this in the words, "We are incorporated in Christ by hearing and believing the Gospel."

Whether or not the gospel has been heard and believed in College Church involves a judgment so heavy and so personal that one dreads to make it and makes it only in fear and trembling. Nevertheless, drawing from theological training and ministerial experience on one hand to secure some sort of measuring rod, and from experience and observation in College Church on the other hand to grasp the thing to be measured, my conviction is that the gospel has been heard in College Church. True, we have heard other things: Zen-Buddhism, humanitarianism with a Christian fringe, Judaism, scientific rationalism, but more often and worse, preaching so poor that even the Holy Spirit had not strength to break through it. But have we not also heard the Gospel? All one can do is to confess that one believes we have.

Knowing students and the kind of spiritual pain they undergo in college years, and the strength some of them have derived from College Church, I am inclined to think that the gospel has not only been heard but believed. This again, however, is difficult if not impossible to measure. All one can do finally is to confess, to declare. Indeed the affirmation that at College Church the gospel has been both heard and believed might well be the strongest ground on which we could claim to be a church.

I find that I am apprehensive, however, about claiming for ourselves Barth's idea of the Church as "event." Possibly it is Barth's language that is frightening, though his awesome expectations are troublesome too. There is something deeply right in his claims, but to listen to his words hardly assures us that we are hearing a description of College Church: "The Congregation is that event in which the absolute sovereignty of Jesus Christ....finds its proper answer and response in the perfect freedom of obedience."[20]

Yet we are not without our moments, if we are without our Events. I am told that the beginning of College Church was a time when students and faculty were held together by a spirit quite unlike anything they had known. They themselves, notably the students and Chaplain Merrimon Cuninggim, gave their efforts and ideas and time unstintingly to bring the church into being. Yet when it had happened it impressed them all -

---

20 Barth, Karl, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

students, faculty, and presidents - as a moment of fulfillment made possible not so much by their efforts and ingenuity as by the grace of God. There have been other times - at our retreats, in the administration of the sacraments, in the regular worship and work of College Church, when we have felt something new and holy coming into being.

A further mark of the church which we have discussed is phrased by Bishop Newbigin when he says, "we are incorporated in Christ by sacramental participation in the life of the historically continuous Church." At this point we are compelled to face both some of the greatest difficulties as well as some of the most compelling opportunities of the College Church.

In the area of "sacramental participation" in the life of the church, we admit a special difficulty. College Church has upon request administered the rite of baptism, but we have not insisted upon baptism as a prerequisite for membership in the College Church. Considering the historic significance of baptism as the visible sign of entry into the Christian College, we confess ourselves to be in an ambiguous situation.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper has possessed rich meaning in the life of College Church and represents to many of our students the most significant service provided. Yet when we ask by what authority the sacrament is administered our answer cannot be entirely satisfying. True, the Christian community which exists within the College Church and its service of worship conveys a *spiritual* authority. Yet if asked upon what *ecclesiastical* authority we administer the sacrament, the chaplain can only answer that it is made possible by his ordination as a minister in a denomination.

Our further and greatest difficulty in claiming "participation in the life of the historically continuous church" derives from the fact that the College Church was established not by a denomination or by several denominations but by students, teachers, and administrators in a group of colleges. We must ask therefore: how can a non-denominational college church, begun and maintained under collegiate rather than ecclesiastical auspices, develop a meaningful and workable relationship to the churches?

We find that we must ask this question and seek answers to it for we know that a Christian church cannot be isolated. College chapel can be, but not a college church. By its very nature relationships are required not only with Christians in its own community, but with Christians in

churches throughout the nation and the world. Furthermore we have an obligation directly to students, some of whom want denominational ties. We have an obligation also to the churches to keep them in touch with their students, so that denominational relationships will not be lost. We have an obligation too in the simple realization that it is to the denominational church that the student will return upon graduation. He is in fact, as a College Church member, still a member of his home church. Our membership card states, "Membership in College Church in no way affects a member's home church affiliations and ceases automatically when he leaves the college community."

But how shall we answer this need for relationship? It is answered in part by our relationships with organizations other than the churches. Our relationship with the Student YMCA and YWCA, sprightly though tenuous, helps greatly. It is at present our only live connection to the student Christian movement. Through the College Church Student Fellowship we are related to the Student "Y" which provides leadership resources and student conferences for which we are grateful. We also have connections with the American Friends Service Committee, the Student Volunteer Movement, and other parts of the student Christian life. All these, however, seem to relate us not so much to the Church as to what may more properly be called "the Christian Community."

Can we then claim no participation in the historically continuous church? No, we believe there are grounds to claim such participation. There are several significant ways in which we have roots in the historical church. For one thing our colleges have come out of the educational thrust of the Christian churches, one of our institutions having been founded by Congregational churches, and all of them declaring allegiance to the values and aims of the Christian faith. Also, the College Church was begun by devoted churchmen, several of them ordained clergy, others committed laymen. Its life at present is led and nourished by students and faculty who have been nurtured in the Christian faith within a variety of churches, and by leaders of the denominations who visit us frequently as guest ministers or who are invited to the campus to meet with students belonging to the denominations they represent. Moreover, the ministry of the College Church, the chaplaincy, has been occupied by men ordained by the Congregational, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches. Through these relationships the inheritance of the church has been great. But is it enough? Clearly it is not. We are challenged to explore new ways to broaden and deepen the relationship and to open ourselves more widely to the inheritance of the historically continuous church.

IV

The Task Ahead

We believe that the College Church is an authentic Christian Church. We feel ourselves to be in the historic protestant tradition of the "gathered" church, a conviction deepened by the sense of community which comes upon us in worship, in work, and in common confession. Though several problems critically important to this claim remain unsolved, other areas offer striking possibilities for service greatly needed by the Christian Church. As we look to the task ahead then, we shall seek not only to find answers to the problems but also to explore the unusual opportunities which our special situation open to us. Let us consider four tasks which lie ahead.

In reference to the main unsolved problem, participation in the historically continuous church, we ask ourselves: might it be possible, after careful and long-range study and exploration, for the College Church to achieve some kind of officially acknowledged relationship with the denominations? Surely it would have to be done carefully and slowly over a period of years, for the questions we would encounter would be both complex and tough, not prone to easy, quick answers. Very possibly, perhaps inevitably, we would find that many different denominational agencies desired to exercise some kind of control over the College Church. Remembering the responsibilities the College Church has to students, faculty, and the colleges, this matter could become troublesome to state the case mildly. Easy solutions would almost certainly be wrong ones for we would not need ingenuity or organizational skill so much as mutual understanding and confidence among people who at present have few relationships. Progress would depend not on cleverness, but on consultations and patient exploration.

A promising field for exploration has been proposed by Professor Gordon Kaufman of Pomona College. It is this: might not the College Church be best understood as a missionary church, as an outpost on a frontier? The idea grows in merit as one considers it. The college church as a mission church would expect to be different from the usual local church. It is different in order to deal realistically with the unique situation in which it works. Both college and mission churches may find themselves working with a special age group of members; in both the congregations may have a certain lack of stability. Both must be flexible and adaptive, ready to adjust their techniques and programs for the more adequate preaching and understanding of their message. Both must see as part of their mission their work with persons who do not accept the

Christian faith.

With this idea in mind we propose to explore with the churches the possibility that they might recognize our church as their mission on the college campus. How might we represent them? Several organizational possibilities are worth careful consideration. One might be to initiate under the joint auspices of the College Church and the churches monthly denominational meetings on a Sunday evening in place of one of the regular meetings of the College Church Student Fellowship. Another might be more actively to promote student participation in denominational intercollegiate conferences. Such efforts might enable us to represent the churches without in any way injuring the ecumenical spirit we cherish.

We shall also need to explore ways to develop relationships to interdenominational organizations such as the United Student Christian Council and the National Council of Churches of Christ. Since local churches may not be related directly to the National Council and relationships are open only through denominations, whatever associations we may work out, at least in our present circumstances, would be functional and cooperative, but would not establish us as constituent part of the Council. An integral relationship to the USCC has greater possibilities for the immediate future and even in our present situation, due to the connection we have with the Student YMCA and YWCA.[21]

We believe we have an extraordinary opportunity to witness to the power and rightness of ecumenicity in modern Christendom. Bishop Sherrill has located the great present difficulty in the ecumenical movement in "the fact that it is primarily among leaders of the Church. It has not yet sufficiently reached the great mass of clergy and lay people in all our churches." The College Church contains particular promise to meet this need for already it finds itself to be an ecumenical movement in microcosm. It has untold opportunities to explore and to find solutions to the problems of corporate faith and worship among those who come from diverse denominational backgrounds.

Commenting upon the striking opportunity the College Church possesses for ecumenical venture, Professor Theodore M. Greene has written that the members of College Church "can and should come to it

---

21 Dr. Hubert Noble, formerly chaplain at Occidental College and now General Director of the Commission on Christian Higher Education of the National Council of Churches has written of their solution to this problem at Occidental: "...we claimed membership and gave financial support to the Southern California Council of Churches and the Los Angeles Church Federation. We contributed to USCC. We claimed membership in the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches, but also claimed membership in the youth movements of the five major denominations (in terms of student membership) on the campus."

from various denominations. Its student members, moreover, are young ....young enough to be flexible and adaptable, not yet set in a rigid mold of ecclesiastical and theological orthodoxy. Its faculty members should be, by virtue of their professional training, unusually well qualified to participate creatively in an ecumenical experiment. If this venture is conceived of as an authentic missionary venture, a bold sustained experiment in ecumenical thinking, worshipping and living, the results might well be as notable as are those of the amazingly successful Church of South India. Far more might, I believe, be hoped for along these lines on a college campus, as on a missionary field, than in an ordinary community with its present multiplicity of rival churches."[22]

This kind of venture would require us to raise and explore this question at least: what is the appropriate relationship between the College Church, which seeks to be inclusive for the protestant campus community, and the denominational groups on campus? At Claremont we have few such organizations so that our problem may not be nearly so complicated as it might be in other institutions. We have only three groups which meet regularly, those for our Episcopal, Christian Scientist, and Unitarian students. The last mentioned is not so much denominational as designed to serve students of sharply liberal religious convictions. In addition we have a chapter of the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship whose point of difference is not denominational but ideological, seeking to attract students of a fundamentalist persuasion and to advance that conviction among others. There are also organizations on the campus for our Jewish and Roman Catholic students.

The College Church seeks to be inclusive but in its present situation it seems best prepared to meet the needs of Congregationalists, Disciples, Friends, Methodists, and Presbyterians. Happily many students in the Baptist, Christian Science, Episcopal, Lutheran and Unitarian denominations are active in the leadership and membership of College Church, but the experience seems to be less fully satisfying to them. These groups, except the Episcopalians, do not represent a large number of students in our colleges. Theologically and temperamentally the church does not seem to attract fundamentalist students in substantial number. This means that though we wish to be inclusive, we are not. Perhaps we will have to accept this. To be sure, there is reason to believe that campus religious life may be best nourished by varied points of view. Yet many of us remain convinced that if we could go deeply enough we could find common ground in College Church on which all may stand.

---

22 Greene, Theodore M., *op. cit.*

The brokenness of the body is painful and the hope remains, remembering the oneness of God and the grace of God, that we may be both inclusive, both broad and deep - cruciform in character.

In any event, we believe that the ecumenical challenge of our church opens to us an especially promising field of exploration. Surely the objective in such an inquiry would not be to cause a shift of loyalty from the students' denomination to the ecumenical movement. Rather it would be to introduce students to ecumenical life, to familiarize them with the world organizations of the church and so to enable them to become better members of their denominations. While not forgetting the unique nature and the particular contribution of the denominations we might learn together that our faith is one faith and that there is one God who is above all, through all, and in all.

The College Church has a unique opportunity to think through the relationship of commitment to openness, to explore the meaning of the church for the academic community and of the academic community for the church. We believe that the influence of religion on the campus will be immeasurably strengthened as we study the interdependence of the community of faith and the community of inquiry. We need to provide a clear witness that honest doubt is not antithetical to valid faith. We would assert that a mature Christian may always be committed to Christian truth as he now understands it and still be open to new understandings of God's ways. We would also assert that a part of the evangelistic as well as the educational task of a college church is to work with those who are unwilling to commit themselves at any point, who stand at the edge of faith, who are able only to consider it, to explore its claims.

Professor John Dillenberger of the Harvard Divinity School has stated the case succinctly in a personal letter. He writes: "The problem of a college church....seems to me to be one of the urgent necessity of combining commitment and openness simultaneously. This is perhaps the most difficult thing to achieve, but certainly the most important. One of the difficulties....is that neither the churches nor those who have written on religion and the university have taken sufficiently into account the nature of the academic community. The concern has been rather too much....the emphasis upon the student in isolation from what this particular pilgrimage of four years is supposed to be about. What responsibility does the church have to rethink its strategy and functions in the light of what exploration in a college community means? What does searching and seeking and openness mean in relation to the mission of the church, in relation to an institution which has this as its real object?"

And how far must the church also assume this risk, consciously and willingly, even as it also encourages new and fresh commitment? Does not the church have an obligation to do better even than the university does in terms of this ideal?"

There is another related opportunity open to College Church: to understand and learn from students and faculty members who hold themselves altogether apart both from the church and from the faith. We would seek also to communicate the gospel to them in terms which will clearly show its relevance to the human situation. If we are right in our conviction that the "Community of the Holy Spirit" may embrace those who for reasons good or ill reject the church, if we are right in asserting that men may be touched by the Christ of eternity while not accepting the verbalizations of the church about the historical Jesus, then we may surely claim spiritual relationship with such persons. Assuming of course that we ourselves, in the church, are also touched by the Holy Spirit! Another of the tasks before us then is to seek to find ways to learn what is in the hearts and minds of those students and teachers, and to help them understand the significance of the Gospel.

Most if not all of the questions we have raised in this paper are immediately familiar to religious leaders in colleges and universities which sponsor churches. We are hoping that answers are being found on other campuses. Therefore we urgently invite readers to help us in the three year study we are now beginning. We believe that if it is possible to find solutions to the problems which we have described, our local study must be strengthened by a cooperative effort involving many students, faculty, chaplains in other institutions, and leaders in the denominations and the ecumenical movement.

Comments on

THE CHURCH AND THE COLLEGE CHURCH

I

Harry E. Smith
Minister to Students
The Presbyterian Church
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

On first glance, the College Church at Claremont appears ideal. To a denominational college pastor weary of being regarded as the proprietor of a denominational home-away-from-home or the shepherd of a flock of carefully branded sheep, Chaplain Rankin's description sounds too good to be true. It suggests exciting possibilities for a Christian community transcending denominational divisions, unfettered by ecclesiastical entanglements, free to explore and develop meaningful liturgy, and inclusive of both seekers and believers, the unwashed as well as the carefully labeled "elect."

And yet, closer examination of the paper leaves me bothered and not as discontent as I might be with all the encumbrances of a denominational student pastorate. Rankin quotes with approval Newbigin's demand for "sacramental participation in the life of the historically continuous church"; Barth's claim that the Church must be thought of as an "event....in which the absolute sovereignty of Jesus Christ finds its proper answer and response"; and Tillich's description of the "latent church," existing wherever persons respond, singly or corporately, to the Holy Spirit without awareness of the source of the particular nature of the motivating power which acts upon them - giving the impression that these criteria for the church are enough to include any "church" that claims the title.

My first concern, therefore, is with his tendency to extract a bit from each description, rather than pushing through to any creative statement of the relation between form and tradition, between continuity and discontinuity, between protest and creation. Jenkin's conception of "tra-

ditioning" in *Freedom, Tradition and the Spirit* seems a helpful way out of this tension between freedom and tradition in the Church, and might say a sharp word to a college church.

I wonder also if this kind of congregational life is truly *ecumenical* or simply interdenominational or non-denominational. My understanding of ecumenicity demands a healthy and continued facing of the factors which divide us most sharply - and the unity that I know in Jesus Christ has been arrived at not *in spite of* or *in addition to* but through facing up to the questions of doctrine and polity which divide us. To be ecumenical, in this sense, requires, and has pushed us historically to, a new appreciation of denominational heritages and an ability to state with conviction our respective contributions to the whole Church, while at the same time demands a willingness to grow through the encounter with those of other traditions. This is simply to raise in another way the question about the relation of the college church to "the life of the historically contiuous church" where the college church has no formal ties with any denomination, but becomes, as many Community Churches have, a new non-denominational denomination. The recognized partialness of each denomination necessitates a constant search for the whole in ecumenical encounter. Does a college church stimulate this continuing kind of encounter within itself or this sense of inadequacy without the contribution of the total church?

I'm bothered, too, by the kind of churchmanship which is experienced here. If it is possible to belong to this church - albeit a college church - without baptism, with full membership continued in a home church, and a membership containing some who are "reserved in belief," "the exploring unbelievers," then are students getting here a concept of the Church which will prepare them for meaningful participation and leadership in home churches which require baptism, full membership, and support even when the preaching is dull and the membership exclusive? This is one advantage of a *denominational* college church: to make the point that the church back home is not substantially different from the church of college days and has the same potentialities. Does the college church become so qualitatively different from the home church that this experience is irrelevant to the students' later church life?

Denominational affiliation during college provides not only an opportunity for a relationship which can carry through after college days, but also makes possible a growth in awareness of the benevolent causes of the denomination, an understanding of its polity and power structure, and a sense of responsibility which can issue in committed lay leadership after college.

Chaplain Rankin has pointed up both the values and problems involved in a college church, and his conclusion suggests that he is dealing creatively with the problems. His insight and searching approach indicate that any direction which is pursued may, in fact, prove the "valuable contribution to the ecumenical movement at the local level" which he suggests.

II

Harry H. Kruener
Dean of the Chapel
Denison University

A year ago, after fifteen years in the "regular ministry," I became Dean of the Chapel here. Since then I have consciously or unconsciously been trying to get my theological bearings. I felt in the Church and yet out of it. Likewise, I have discovered that a college chapel is like a Church and yet not like it.

Our comments are supposed to reflect our own situation. Mine is a college chapel of a church-related campus of 1,300 students. Chapel is held on Thursday evenings. It is understood that the service is to be Christian and Protestant, so we are able to mark some theological boundaries. As in the Claremont College Church, however, the service has limits within Protestantism, being without much appeal either to fundamentalists or the Unitarians.

Of interest to this paper would be the "church features" of the Chapel, or the absence of them: we have no creed, but there is no hesitancy to preach theologically; communion services are held four times a year; the seasons of Advent and Lent and other holy days are observed; the local church services are advertised in the chapel bulletin with a statement that the college chapel "is no substitute for Sunday worship in the church of your particular communion and faith"; the local ministers are represented on the Chapel Committee and are increasingly on the inside. In short, we are a College Chapel, not a Church; but we are developing certain "churchly" features. Perhaps we may be changing in the direction of a College Church. We are increasingly conscious of some change going on and quite dissatisfied with being a theological hybrid. Bob Rankin's paper, therefore, may help describe for us what others are doing and thinking further down the same road.

It is fascinating to think, though I would not dare to assert, that a

College Chapel such as ours can be part of the Church. Sociologically, we might get under the wire: we are a visible community whose purpose is the worship of God revealed in Jesus Christ. But what a mess we are in theologically! We are a community by fiat of administration, and it is not always easy to see the marks of "apostolic succession" in the celestial company of administrators. Of course some of us might feel, without being heretic to Protestantism, that the Holy Spirit might be moving historically as much through dedicated educators as through clergymen, and that in truth a college chapel might be a "congregation of faith" as well as any church. The decision for membership would be part of the decision to come to an avowedly Christian college.

I agree with Rankin's feeling that the college church or chapel must somehow come under Newbigin's classification of a "Church of the Holy Spirit," if it is to have status of any sort. And the Holy Spirit might be quite alive in Academia.

The "latent church" of Paul Tillich certainly also holds out hope. It is a generous and comforting concept. My Catholic friends use it: they say that while I can't be saved "extra ecclesiam," I can be saved as a "latent" Catholic. One chapter in Herberg's *Judaism and Modern Man* holds out the same hope for me as a Jew. In reality, I suppose sensitive men of faith all like to define the Church without exclusion of other persons, and this may not be far off base.

The Church is "known only to God." Certainly a college chapel can fit this description more accurately than many churches. If the classical marks of the Church - one, holy, Catholic, and apostolic - are correct, then no visible church has them, and the college chapel may have more of some of them than the average church. Far from being less than a church, it may actually be more.

After all, there is a fascination to a college audience at worship. The potential Christian community is certainly there bright with promise. The rebels can be pictured as showing faith even in their resistance. The Word is preached and college students have a magnificant awareness of the non-Christian and the "phoney." The music rises in pure praise, nothing half done or sentimental or self-centered. As intellectuals we have the opportunity to see the Eternal Logos moving with power through many present day avenues of art, literature, politics and much so-called secular life. Conversions often come with a suddenness and completeness that makes the "regular ministry" look tame by comparison. As Rankin points out, we may not have any eschatological "Event" in Chapel, but we certainly have our "moments."

Kenneth Reeves
University Presbyterian Church
San Antonio, Texas

It appears to be quite unnecessary, in the light of subsequent discussion in the paper on the nature of the church, to make a distinction between the sociological and theological characteristics of the church and to say that the latter has priority over the former. Even the terms, sociological and theological, are limited. They are too technical to carry enough meaning. In essence, it seems enough to emphasize and elaborate that the Church is a visible community of human beings who have responded to Jesus Christ and His revelation of the nature of deity.

The most interesting impression which College Church makes is the cautious, rational process by which it seeks to find itself and to take steps toward responding to the New Testament view of the church. College Church seems to be seeking to be a church by approved academic procedures. While not under the thumb of the Administration it is under the authority of academic method, which method is normally informed by an ideology at variance with that by which the Church is created.

Can a church be a church within and under a state, or a college, or any group? There certainly can be Christian, religious communities in colleges. College Church claims to be on its own, yet it seems to operate by those same cautious, highly individualistic, rational, conservative processes which are typical of the academic scene.

Here alongside Trinity University in San Antonio and on campus we have the University Presbyterian Church. It is a parish church. There are no organic connections with the University. It is a church inclusive of all ages, occupations, peoples, and income groups. There are many students, faculty, and administrative people in the membership. The church is very mindful of the university environment, yet probably does not respond to that environment as keenly as College Church. This may be the weakness from the College Church's standpoint. University Church's uniqueness is its specific Biblical, historical, theological, sociological heritage and connections. Students find a church inclusive of doctrine and of members. There are obvious family connections. There is unity. There are the sacraments. And there is openness in regard to inquiry and search. The Koinonia wants more to be formed by responses of love than by succumbing to pressure.

One weakness of University Church is its denominational tie to the Presbyterian family. It cannot be a church home for students who belong to other groups. Yet, the breadth of ecumenical churchmanship it does express allows for a reciprocal arrangement on Holy Communion with the Episcopalians; the Lord's Supper is being celebrated in University Church by ministers of both denominations.

IV

Sidney Lovett
University Chaplain
Yale University

Bob Rankin's thoughtful paper on the Church and the College Church is both timely and provocative. The "many splendored thing" which is the Church defies any complete or final delineation, as the long history of Christian doctrine attests. Experience teaches us that the Christian Church has more resemblance to a portrait than to a map. As such it lends itself to description rather than to definition. This distinction is bound to issue in a more catholic and less provincial concept of the Church, and one that reckons with God's people who are outside the fold as well as God's servants who are within.

The establishment and growth of the College Church elicits our admiration. Without historical antecedents or ecclesiastical determination of its polity, courage and imagination have gone into its foundation and its subsequent development. While not eschewing ways and means of relating College Church more closely to other local parishes of a more denominational character, my belief is that there are certain points of difference that are both inevitable and important. One of these is the emphasis of the College Church on catholicity as over against denominationalism as earlier suggested. Whenever the Church becomes so *exclusive* in its operation that it does not regard God's people who are outside its bounds, the Church denies the humanity of its Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. When the church becomes so *inclusive* in its operation that it mistakes ecclesiastical authority for spiritual power, or fails to set its members hard lessons to learn in holy living, then the Church denies the divinity of its Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. It is the peculiar genius of a College Church to keep these two opposing tendencies in proper balance.

V

Milton D. McLean
Coordinator of Religious Activities
Ohio State University

The problem raised by Chaplain Rankin is timely. College chaplains and university religious workers are dissatisfied with a ministry to fragmented groups or "fellowships," unrelated organically to "the Body of Christ" - the Church. This, I say parenthetically, is not a problem for the Roman Catholic Chaplain, since the relationship of Catholic students to the Church is clearly defined; nor to the Jewish Rabbi, since membership in the Jewish community is only loosely defined. It is, therefore, a problem which is faced primarily by the chaplains who are concerned with classical Christianity. Groups at the extreme right - fundamentalists or extremely conservative Christian groups, as well as sects - do not face a problem. To them you are "saved" or "lost," or you "belong" or "do not belong." No attempt is made to relate the church to the inclusive or "secular" college community. The church and the college become one only in institutions entirely controlled by one of these churches. Nor is membership in a college church a problem to those on the left. To them the church and the college are separate entities. In short, the problem raised by Chaplain Rankin is one that concerns those committed to an ecumenical Christian faith, such as is expressed by the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches of Christ.

We may restrict the problem further by distinguishing between four groups associated with the National Council of Churches of Christ. At the right are those who lean toward the Anglo-Catholic conception of the church. Like the Roman Catholics, they are not prepared to accept persons into "the church" without proper instruction and initiatory rites. Such restrictions rules out a "college church."

At the left are those who hold a position not unlike that held by ministers of Community Churches. To them the formation of a College Church is relatively simple. Create a permissive fellowship, inclusive in spirit. Let the members in democratic fashion shape the pattern of worship and determine the basis of membership. Establish relationships with ethical and religious movements but remain free from entangling denominational alliances.

It appears to this commentator that Chaplain Rankin is caught between these two groups. He has two choices. Granted his theological

premises, he must eventually identify the college church with one of the major Protestant denominations - Congregational-Christian, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, etc., or as he suggests by his question ("Would it be feasible to develop a relationship with the National Council of Churches?") with Protestantism as a whole. Either choice will confront the College Church at Claremont with problems. Since no mention is made of the possibility of becoming a "denominational" church, it is assumed that this practical alternative has been ruled out. Is it possible to follow the fourth and last alternative without in effect developing a new "denomination"?

The Claremont Church could, like community churches, produce an alumni body. If other college churches did the same, a fellowship of Christian College Churches, like the fellowship of Community Churches, could be formed. It is conceivable that such a fellowship might leaven the movement toward unity among the major deniminations and bring about eventually, the Christian Church of America.

VI

Samuel Rudder
Chaplain, St. Augustine's College
Raleigh, North Carolina

There are many desirable features presented in this article, some of which could be incorporated in the religious program of most, it not all, of our colleges. The most important of these features, to my mind, is the possibility of overcoming some of the difficulties presented by the various denominational groups on the campus. Common allegiances to one College Church might bridge the gap now found in secular brotherliness, as contrasted to brotherhood in Christ, on our college campuses.

It would, however, be highly improbable, if not impossible, to undertake such a project at a church related school, such as St. Augustine's. However fine the line may be drawn, the establishment of such a program would result in the sacrifice of some religious principles. To some, these principles may be "theoligical pecularities," but they can be sacrificed only at the expense of the stultification of conscience and intellect. Problems of authority, tradition and liturgy are but a few of the many that would be encountered in the establishment of such a college church.

Critical students of the New Testament may question some of the inferences and implications in Chaplain Rankin's thesis on the church. This writer is tempted to ask if this church would not be another step in the breakdown of corporate Christianity, leading eventually to the recognition of the church as a voluntary human association.

THE BAKER MANUFACTURING COMPANY
- PRINTERS -
NEW BEDFORD, MASS.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CHAPLAINS

"Membership shall consist of Chaplains, Deans of Chapels, Directors religious activities, and such other administratively employed and/or desi nated personnel as are responsible for the total religious program of t college and university community."

Officers and Executive Committee

1956 - 1957

PRESIDENT
E. C. Reckard
Brown University

VICE PRESIDENT
George Bean
United States Military Academy

SECRETARY
Robert H. Bonthius
Vassar College

TREASURER
James Hudson
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College

HISTORIAN
Seymour A. Smith
Yale Divinity School

PAST PRESIDENT
Harold E. Bernhard
Iowa State Teachers College

Charles C. Noble
Syracuse University

W. Maynard Sparks
Lebanon Valley College

Daniel G. Hill
Howard University

George Kalbfleisch
Dartmouth College

Ralph G. Dunlop
Northwestern University

Holmes N. Vanderbeck
Springfield College

Committee on Publications

Charles Havice, Chairman
Northeastern University

Sam Newcomer
Colby Junior College

Richard Unsworth
Smith College

Theodore Jones
Virginia Union University

Harry Kruener
Denison University

Robert Rankin
Claremont Colleges

E. C. Reckard, ex officio
Brown University